



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/627,977   | 07/28/2003  | Andrzej Wozniak      | T2147-908626        | 4096             |
| 181 7590 04/14/2009<br>MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC<br>1751 PINNACLE DRIVE<br>SUITE 500<br>MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| SILVER, DAVID  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 2128   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 04/14/2009   |             | ELECTRONIC           |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ipdocketing@milestockbridge.com  
sstiles@milestockbridge.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/627,977

**Applicant(s)**

WOZNAK, ANDRZEJ

**Examiner**

DAVID SILVER

**Art Unit**

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 105-118 and 130-143 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 105-118 and 130-143 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Instant Office Action is in response to a Request for Continued Examination filed 1/30/2009.
2. Claims 105-118 and 130-143 are currently pending in Instant Application.

***Response to Arguments***

***Response: 35 U.S.C. § 112***

3. **Examiner Response:**

- 3.1 As detailed in Advisory Action dated 12/23/2008, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections have been withdrawn.

***Response: 35 U.S.C. § 102***

4. **Examiner Response:**

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 105-118 and 130-143 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schubert (**US 20030069724 A1**), and in view of Yamanchili's "VHDL: From Simulation to Synthesis", and further in view of OrCAD's "Autorouter User's Guide".

As per claims 105-118, note the rejection of claims 130-143 below. The Instant Claims recite substantially same limitations as the below-rejected claims and are therefore rejected under same prior-

Art Unit: 2128

art teachings.

Schubert discloses: 130. (New) A method for automatically generating a simulation model for a selected configuration of software simulation elements, comprising:

storing a plurality of said software simulation elements, said plurality of software simulation elements provided with inter working connections so as to constitute the simulation model of an architecture, each said software simulation element representing a component (**para 135, 142, 152, para 122**);

creating a simulation of wiring by executing stored regular expressions (**para 122**);

using the configuration definition file, a component and connection rule table, and a connection coherency rule table, wherein the component and connection rule table and the connection coherency rule table are written in a high level language, and the component and connection rule table describes properties of said software components for simulating at least one of the plurality of integrated circuits (**para 122, 135, 142, 152, 18, 93, 198, 227, 91, 275**);

instantiating components based on a configuration definition file; and combining, via a high level language (HLL) code generator, the parameters of the components with the connection rules of the component and connection rule table; (**para 85-84**)

automatically generating source code files comprising the simulation model corresponding to the selected configuration specified by the configuration definition file,

wherein the simulation model comprises software simulation elements each corresponding to an integrated circuit which together comprises the design of a processing machine that conforms to a functional specification of the selected configuration as defined in the configuration definition file (**para 91, 275, 122, 135, 142, 152, 18, 93, 198, 227**).

Schubert however does not expressly disclose the following features: integrated circuit is under development; and "wherein the integrated circuits are not physically present in the processing machine".

Yalamanchili however discloses an analogous system having the above-mentioned features

**(page 7 - top slide).** Note, for example, the the description for manufacture is generated only after simulation, not before.

This is further evidenced by OrCAD which demonstrates routing prior to manufacturing **(page 36 - item Auto DFM)** which discloses design before manufacturing.

In view of the KSR v. Teleflex Supreme Court ruling, it is asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that applying the known technique would have yielded predictable results. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. The known technique of simulating prior to manufacture, and performing simulation on integrated circuits which are simulation model-based is well known and allows engineers to verify performance prior to investment of time and money in circuits. Thus, saving time and money associated with having to remanufacture a circuit with an error.

See MPEP 2145 [R-6], X, B, " [A] person of ordinary skill has good reason to pursue the known options within his or her technical grasp. If this leads to the anticipated success, it is likely that product [was] not of innovation but of ordinary skill and common sense. In that instance the fact that a combination was obvious to try might show that it was obvious under § 103." KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 550 U.S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1397 (2007).

Schubert discloses: 131. The method according to claim 130, wherein the components comprise Active Components, Monitoring and Verification Blocks, Intermediate Blocks, System Blocks, and Global Blocks **(para 15, 23, 122, 123, 138, 141, 146).**

Schubert discloses: 132. The method according to claim 131, further comprising performing a conformity check of the connections by comparing an instance connection table with a table of coherency rules for the physical connections between the models chosen from the blocks to constitute the simulation model **(para 150, 163).**

Schubert discloses: 133. The method according to claim 132, further comprising:

comparing the instance connection table to the connection coherency rule table to detect any

Art Unit: 2128

incompatible connections between the ends of the connections between blocks (**para 150, 163**); and

in cases where an incompatible connection is detected, specifying and adding an adapter component (Intermediate Block) to the instance connection table, said adapter component being inserted into the detected incompatible connection between the components (**para 150, 163, 10, 122**).

Schubert discloses: 134. The method according to claim 133, wherein the component and connection rule table includes properties of the components and contains parameters common to all of the component types and exists in the form of a table distributed into one or more associative tables, and entries being names designating all possible models for the same component (**Fig 29 and description**).

Schubert discloses: 135. The method according to claim 134, wherein the associative tables are adapted to contain a description either in the form of parameter sets or in the form of references to procedures that generate a set of values, and wherein entries of the associative tables comprise names each of which designates a possible model for the same component, and form a character string containing predetermined special identifiers that are replaced by calculated values (**Fig 29 and description**).

Schubert discloses: 136. The method according to claim 135, further comprising:

indicating, using at least three selectors, the instance to be used; and transmitting the following selectors as parameters to a constructor of an HLL object (**Fig 25 and description**): a first selector indicating a current instance (item); a second selector specifying the current instance connected to an end of a port; and a third selector indicating a composite instance corresponding to an active Component containing an observation port (**Fig 29 and description**).

Schubert discloses: 137. The method according to claim 130, further comprising:

representing, by one or more connection coherency rule tables, the rules for interconnecting the components and for inserting intermediate components; representing, by one or more component and connection rule tables, the system- level connection rules and the rules for generating connections between the signals; and representing, by one or more source file formatting tables, the rules for generating instances of HLL objects (**para 170**).

Schubert discloses: 138. The method according to claim 130, further comprising:

uniquely identifying, via an HLL base class, each object instantiated; generating and automatically instantiating System Blocks; using tables to associate the signals connected together under a unique name of the connecting wires; and using a formatting table to generate the hardware description language and HLL source files (**para 21**).

Schubert discloses: 139. The method according to claim 130, further comprising:

receiving, from an operator, a functional specification of the configuration in a high level language; and completing the functional specification with the components in a language other than said high level language (**para 88**).

Schubert discloses: 140. The method according to claim 130, further comprising:

defining, using the following entries in a hash, a Component Type; and correlating, using the following entries in the has, each Component Type to the hash, wherein said hash comprises the following: a first entry comprising a name of a hardware description language (HDL) module of a component and a name of a corresponding source file; and a second entry comprising a definition of a method for selecting the signals that are part of a Port, said definition comprising a set of entries indexed by a name of the Port; wherein said method further includes associating each said Port name with a table of regular expressions and a pointer to a signal connection procedure that controls the application of the expressions to the names of the signals of the interface of the component (**para 221, 409, 455**).

Schubert discloses: 141. The method according to claim 140, wherein

said Component Type comprises one or more Active Components having a generic structure that includes a containing Block that contains an HDL Block including an HDL description and a Block in HLL that provides access paths to HDL resources and a description of the containing block in the high level language (**para 15, 92, 99**);

wherein the set of signals of the HDL Block constitutes an interface of the containing Block, formed by one or more Ports, comprising arbitrary logical selections of signals of an interface, and also formed by interface adapters which provide, in each said Port, two-way communication between the high level language and hardware description language (**para 15, 92, 99**).

Art Unit: 2128

Schubert discloses: 142. A method according to claim 141, further comprising specifying the Ports in the form of regular expressions that select subsets of signals to be connected and define connection rules **(para 15, 92, 99)**.

Schubert discloses: 143. A method according to claim 130, further comprising generating Transfer Components which are inserted to be operable at each side of an interface between servers, said Transfer Components comprising wires for inputs and registers for outputs **(para 15, 92, 99)**.

### ***Support for Amendments and Newly Added Claims***

Applicants are respectfully requested, in the event of an amendment to claims or submission of new claims, that such claims and their limitations be directly mapped to the specification, which provides support for the subject matter. This will assist in expediting compact prosecution. MPEP 714.02 recites: "Applicant should also specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See MPEP § 2163.06. An amendment which does not comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.121(b), (c), (d), and (h) may be held not fully responsive. See MPEP § 714." **Amendments not pointing to specific support in the disclosure may be deemed as not complying with provisions of 37 C.F.R. 1.131(b), (c), (d), and (h) and therefore held not fully responsive.** Generic statements such as "Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced" may be deemed insufficient.

### ***Requests for Interview***

7. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.133(a)(3), requests for interview must be made in advance. Interview requests are to be made by telephone (571-272-8634) call or FAX (571-273-8634). Applicants must provide a detailed agenda as to what will be discussed (generic statement such as "discuss §102 rejection" or "discuss rejections of claims 1-3" may be denied interview). The detail agenda along with any proposed amendments is to be written on a PTOL-413A or a custom form and should be faxed (or emailed, subject to MPEP 713.01.I / MPEP 502.03) to the Examiner at least 3 days prior to the scheduled interview.
8. Interview requests submitted within amendments may be denied because the Examiner was not



Art Unit: 2128

notified, in advance, of the Applicant Initiated Interview Request and due to time constraints may not be able to review the interview request to prior to the mailing of the next Office Action.

***Conclusion***

- All claims are rejected.
- The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Silver whose telephone number is (571) 272-8634. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 10am to 6:30pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kamini S Shah/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128

/DS/  
David Silver, Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2128